



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
097485,820	02/16/00	JEDA	N 0057694

HM22/0802  
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER	
LEVY, N	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1616	7

DATE MAILED: 08/02/01

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

### ADVISORY ACTION

#### THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☒ is extended to run \_\_\_\_\_ or continues to run 3 Months from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).
- ☒ Appellant's response to the final rejection, filed 7/25/01 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
  - ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
  - ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
  - ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☐ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: 1, 3, 7, 8, 11 and 12 are

However:

- ☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s) We concur with applicant's  
commentary on the JP 6 Myrakami reference; they are in the hands of Levy is not  
seen as providing the sum of active with OH fatty acid ester, PVA  
and/or glycol and a PVA point stated to be water soluble.
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented. The present claim 4 & 5 are obvious over Levy, even  
without Myrakami, and TA Higawa was not  
Need for containers, Levy has them; TA Higawa only  
was in interview explanation to answer applicant's demand.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

NEIL S. LEVY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER